

### REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 19-25 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 20, and 22-24 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 2, 9, 13, 19 and 20 stand objected to upon informalities. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22, and 23 stand rejected upon informalities. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19, 21 and 25 stand rejected on prior art grounds. In addition, the specification is objected to. Claims 16-18 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse these objections/rejections based on the following discussion.

#### **I. The Objections to the Specification**

The specification is objected to because of informalities. As such, the Applicants have amended the specification to remove the offending language in accordance with the suggestions of the Examiner. The Office Action indicates that the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, and in particular, that claims 16, 17, and 18 all contain subject matter that is not supported in the specification or drawings. As such, Applicants have cancelled claims 16-18 without prejudice or disclaimer. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

#### **II. The Objections to the Claims**

Claims 2, 9, 13, 19, and 20 are objected to because of informalities. As such, Applicants have amended the claims to remove the offending language and to place the claims in proper

form. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these objections.

### **III. The 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejections**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 19, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. As such, the Applicants have amended the claims to provide proper antecedent basis for the language contained therein. Therefore, in view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

### **IV. The Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 19, 21 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaway, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,500), hereinafter referred to as "Callaway" in view of Ray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,455), hereinafter referred to as "Ray". Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion.

Callaway teaches a transceiver device acting as a master among a plurality of communication devices potentially acting as slaves to the master. The transceiver device includes a transmitter, a receiver coupled to the transmitter, and a processor coupled to the transmitter and the receiver. The processor is programmed to poll the slaves at a first interval and then receive a communication request while polling from a first slave of the plurality of communication devices to communicate with at least a second slave of the plurality of

communication devices. The master then designates communication parameters for communication between the first slave and at least the second slave and then polls at a re-polling interval the first slave and at least the second slave to confirm the termination of communication between the first slave and at least the second slave.

Ray teaches a method, apparatus, and system for dynamic allocation of a network address associated with a virtual subnet to a network device having a transceiver coupled to a network for broadcasting an address server query message in response to initialization of the network device and an address server coupled to the network sending the network address associated with a virtual subnet to the network device in response to the address server receiving the address server query message.

However, neither Callaway nor Ray teach "wherein at least one Super-master-designate is selected from said Master-designate and at least one Proxy-Slave is selected for each Master-designate," as provided by amended independent claims 1, 8, and 19. In fact, there is no suggestion in either Callaway or Ray of this particular manner of defining the Super-master designate, which is different from the mere master node(s) defined in Callaway. Specifically, the claimed invention uses a deterministic methodology to decide on the final set of masters and slaves so as to efficiently assign slaves to masters. Thereafter, a "Super-master" is elected, which is required for counting the actual number of masters and for collecting information about all the nodes. This aspect of the claimed invention also corrects the effect of the randomness introduced in the previous stage of the method according to the invention, whereby the election of the Super-Master may be interleaved with the cluster formation, thereby enhancing communication speed of the ad hoc network formation. This "Super-master" node formation is a novel aspect of the

claimed invention, which the prior art of record is silent on.

Furthermore, even if Callaway and Ray were legally combinable with each other, they would still fail to teach the novel aspects of the invention. The invention provides a much more streamlined approach and a simpler concept than the proposed combination of Callaway and Ray. Therefore, the invention is different from Callaway and Ray, whether alone or in combination with one another, and moreover, the invention is unobvious in light of the restrictive teachings of Callaway and Ray.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 19 are amended herein to further describe the invention and to further distinguish the invention from the cited prior art of record. Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art do not teach or suggest the features defined by amended independent claims 1, 8, and 19 and as such, claims 1, 8, and 19 are patentable over Callaway and Ray, alone or in combination with one another. Further, dependent claims 2-7, 9-15, 18, and 20-25 are similarly patentable over Callaway and Ray, alone or in combination with one another, not only by virtue of their dependency from patentable independent claims, respectively, but also by virtue of the additional features of the invention they define. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

#### **V. Formal Matters and Conclusion**

With respect to the objections to the specifications and claims, the specification and

claims have been amended, above, to overcome these objections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the specification and claims. Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 20, and 22-24 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are allowable if rewritten in independent form. As such, Applicants have amended claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 20, and 22-24 in independent form to place them in immediate condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-15 and 19-25, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary.

Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit  
Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 2, 2004



Mohammad S. Rahman  
Reg. No. 43,029  
McGinn & Gibb, P.L.L.C.  
2568-A Riva Road  
Suite 304  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
(301) 261-8625 - voice  
(301) 261-8825 - fax  
Customer Number: 28211

09/634,123

29